

Open Space Discussion Group No 6

Communicating Monitoring and Evaluation Findings

Host: Phivos Papachristoforou (Cyprus NRN)

Background

Communication about monitoring and evaluation findings is one of the tasks of NRNs for the next programming period. This was one of the reasons why this topic was suggested as a key communication issue for the open space discussion.

The topic was discussed with a group of 6 participants (from Cyprus NRN, Flemish NRN, Portuguese NRN, Greek NRN, ENRD CP).

Initial remarks:

- In some countries (e.g. Flanders, Cyprus) **different ministries** are responsible for different parts of the RDP. One of the difficulties with regard to carrying out (& communicating) evaluation is the **lack of exchange**/ sharing of information about the programme between the different ministries.
- **Ex-post evaluation results are late** for the new programme development. **Mid-term evaluation results can be possibly used**; e.g. can provide justification for/ explain the reallocation for resources to the public.

Discussion points

Some of the **key questions** to be addressed with regard to **communicating 'monitoring & evaluation findings'** are:

- To Whom? (i.e. who is the target of this communication?)
- What? (i.e. what parts of the evaluations should be communicated?)
- How? (i.e. what should be the form(at) of communication?)
- Feedback? (i.e. is it for information 'only'; or should it be a two-way communication?)

Role of the network (What? & How? & Feedback?)

- One of the main roles of the network is to **facilitate discussions about the evaluation results**.
- **"Informal evaluation"** by the network: The network can fill the gaps with regard to missing information from evaluations (i.e. providing information available through the network).

To Whom?

- How to **make evaluation results interesting** to the wider public? This is a challenge difficult to address by networks. According to participants this kind of task should be rather carried out by the European Commission.
- The target group should be rather **policy-makers** (at all levels: national, regional), e.g. ministers. And the purpose should be to better inform (decision) policy-making. The aim is to avoid misinterpretation of results; to provide further factual information & objective data

It would be useful to have further exchange on data collection methods between networks (e.g. how to identify weaknesses in the evaluation).

In sum:

- The main role of the network can be to facilitate exchange about the results of evaluation; avoid misinterpretation and identify possible weaknesses in evaluations.
- The main target group of dissemination should be policy-makers (i.e. to help them better understand the RDP evaluation results).
- The added value of disseminating results to the wider public is less evident from a network point of view. It can possibly more efficiently done at the European level.